

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**APPLICANT:** Martin S. Maltz                      **EXAMINER:** Steven Y Kau  
**SERIAL NO.:** 10/635,381                      **GROUP:** 2625  
**FILED:** 8/05/2003                      **ATTY DKT NO.:** D/A2290  
**TITLE: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR CONTROLLING OUT-OF-GAMUT  
MEMORY AND INDEX COLORS**

---

**Please forward all correspondence to:**

ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC  
Patent Attorneys  
P.O. Box 4484  
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Interview Summary dated August 30, 2010 in the  
above captioned matter, please enter the following remarks:

Remarks begin on Page 2 of this Paper.

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Examiner Interview**

Applicant's representative, Kevin Soules, conducted a telephonic interview of Examiner Steven Kau on August 25, 2010. The Applicant provided the Examiner with a set of proposed claim amendments to claims 10 and 23 via fax. The Applicant and Examiner briefly discussed prior art citations to Shimizu and Mahy in relation to claims 1, 10 and 23. The Examiner indicated that the Shimizu reference teaches the structure of the claimed invention and that the Mahy reference teaches the concept of the claimed invention.

The Examiner indicated that the Application had not been approved for allowance by the examiner's supervisor. The Examiner further indicated that narrowing amendments to the claims might improve the patentability of the invention over the prior art. The Examiner indicated that he did not have authority to speak to the possible allowance of the Application based on the provided proposed claim amendments. The Examiner indicated that in view of new claim amendments a new search would be performed and the results of the prosecution would be presented to his supervisor.

The Applicant's Representative generally argued that the proposed claim amendments left the claims in condition for allowance over the prior art. No agreement was reached between the Examiner and the Applicant's Representative.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicant has provided a summary of the substance of the examiner interview. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: September 7, 2010

---

Kevin Soules  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 66,033  
ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC  
P.O. Box 4484  
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484  
Tel. (505) 314-1312